UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

A Crack in the White Wall - - - - - - - - - - *Morton M. Berman*

America's Choices Narrow Down - - - - - - - - - *Thomas K. Sampson*

Humanism and the Present Religious Horizon — Part III - - - *A. Stiernotte*

VOLUME CXXVI NUMBER 1

Chicago, September 2, 1940

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 3

ARTICLES—
A Crack in the White Wall—MORTON M. BERMAN 6
America's Choices Narrow Down—THOMAS K. SAMPSON 9
Humanism and the Present Religious Horizon—Part III—A. STIERNOTTE 10
On the Pacifist Front—XXI 13

POETRY—
Crosses in France—THOMAS CURTIS CLARK 5
The Oneness of All Souls—VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH 8

CORRESPONDENCE—
Editorial Correction—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 15
The Conscientious Objector—American Civil Liberties Union 15
More About "Communist Confusion"—EDWARD K. BARSKY 15
Emma Goldman—NORMAN B. BARR 16
UNITY Policy Commended—GEORGE L. MASON 16
Warm Approval—ELIOT WHITE 16

THE FIELD—
Best Use of Manpower—The New York *Post* 2

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Best Use of Manpower

Mobilization of our manpower for national defense is a problem with the same elements as mobilization of our capacity to produce military equipment. We must use our resources of men as carefully and efficiently as our resources of steel or gasoline. The timing is important: our manpower must be free to do the most effective job at the given moment. And there must be coördination between military plant and personnel.

At the moment there is a demand that the United States adopt at once a system of universal compulsory military training. The suggestion was advanced editorially by the New York *Times*. It has the endorsement of President Roosevelt, the presidents of several colleges and considerable Congressional support.

Yet at the present time universal compulsory military training is totally impractical. It would not fit the present need. It would spend our resources of men in a fruitless, badly timed effort.

Such a system fits none of our present needs. "Universal" training in the United States would include some 30,000,000 men. We have no use for such a vast army, nor have we the equipment with which they could either train or fight. There would be no sense at all in taking several millions of men away from useful civilian occupations to teach them the etiquette of army life, how to march in formation and how to present arms with a broomstick.

Some of the people who now argue in favor of universal compulsory training are actually thinking of the selective draft and perhaps favor putting it into effect in peacetime. When the time comes, if it ever does, to add to the number of men we have at arms, then the selective draft is certainly the proper method to employ. From experience we know that the number of men who will volunteer is small and the process is slow. The volunteers include many whose abilities could be put to far better wartime use. The selective draft is not only the most efficient way to raise an army but the most democratic.

Right now the United States does not need more men in its military establishment than are already provided for. We have nearly 1,000,000 officers and men: the Regular Army will soon be composed of 375,000, there are 251,000 in the National Guard, 186,750 ROTC trainees in the colleges and universities, 118,000 reserve officers, 37,500 trained annually by the Citizens Military Training Corps and 10,000 cadets. The men in the latter classes need additional training, but their number greatly exceeds the available modern, mechanized equipment they would need were they called upon to fight.

Already we have allowed our emphasis on mere numbers of men to get ahead of the supply of military machines. If the battles of the present war have shown anything, they have proved how devastating this mistake can be.

(*Continued on page* 16)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVI MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1940 No. 1

ATTENTION—HERR HITLER!

"Never was a leader so endowed and weaponed; never a leader had found such followers; and what was the result of this vast power, these immense armies, burned cities, squandered treasures, immolated millions of men? All passed like the smoke of his artillery, and left no trace. He left France smaller and poorer than when he found it. France served him with life, limb, estate. But when men saw that each victory meant only another war; that, after toiling so desperately, they were never nearer reward, or ease—they deserted. The eternal law of man and of the world ruined him."

Ralph Waldo Emerson,
on Napoleon Bonaparte, in
Representative Men.

IF THE WORST HAPPENS!

We have ourselves—those inner resources of the inner life which can no more fail the heart of man than fountains fail the wilderness! No man can be a slave who does not inwardly consent to be a slave. No man is in prison whose soul is free. No man is poor or starving who has one strain of music singing in his heart or a single line of poetry echoing in his mind. Yes, we have ourselves. "You can bind my body," said Epictetus to his master, "but you cannot bind my soul." Secondly, *we have one another*—those comrades of the spirit, visible and invisible, whom we possess as the objects of our love! Closer to us than breathing are our husbands and wives and children, whose mere presence is comfort for every ill. Nearer than hands and feet are the friends who would lay down their lives for us as we for them. We are not alone nor forlorn even if these loved ones be torn from us, for their essence is of the spirit, and they live as live the saints and martyrs of an ancient day whose deeds are still our food and drink. "Compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight . . . and run with patience the race that is set before us." Lastly, *we have God,* the living spirit of all truth, and righteousness, and peace! God as an idea may be difficult to apprehend, but not as a presence to be felt and known. This universe is a living universe. It moves by an impulsion that is more than the mere coördination of its material particles. It has purposes, produces values, attains goals. It flowers in human personalities, and as conscience, intellect, and moral vision reveals the essence of its being. The universe, in other words, is not blind but conscious, not flung about by chance but directed by ends and aims, not heedless but heedful of the right. When we strive for good, therefore, the good is with us. And what is this good but God who will not because he cannot fail? Whatever the disasters of this time, we refuse to believe that God is going to be beaten. "If God is for us, who can be against us?" Not Hitler, any more than Attila or Genghis Khan!

"For right is right since God is God,
And right the day shall win."

LOGICAL POSITIONS IN THIS CRISIS

There are two positions in this crisis in American affairs which seem to us to be wholly logical. Two positions only! One is the position that we should keep out of the European war, which is only the latest chapter of European history, sprung straight from the war of 1914-18 and Versailles, and certain to ruin all the nations that are involved in it. Our business is to safeguard democracy on these shores, and use our fortunate position as a neutral to hasten peace and heal the wounds that may well lead to death. The other is the position that we should enter this war now, since it is our war, democracy's war, and is at this moment being won or lost in the great battle of Britain. To let England fight our fight, to lean for defense upon the English fleet and do nothing ourselves to sustain that fleet—this is as disgraceful as it is dangerous. We should declare war and take up arms against Germany *now!* These two positions, we repeat, are logical and sincere. We understand and respect the men who hold them. What we cannot understand, and find hard to respect, is the attitude of those who want us to stay out of the war, and yet want us to go in at least to the extent of aiding England by every means in our power "short of war." We must maintain our neutrality —and yet send planes and ammunition to England, sell destroyers to her for her fleet, provide goods and food and money, and yet ourselves remain at peace. This straddling of the issue is of course ridiculous. There is only one way really to explain so inconsistent a policy. The advocates of "everything short of war" really want to take America into the war and propose to do so. But they see the people overwhelmingly opposed to this idea! Therefore they set themselves to the task of cajoling the people, frightening them, persuading them, and little by little committing them, until they are at last aroused to war, unknowingly

involved in war, and thus brought to the point where they are in and cannot draw back. These "short of war" people, headed by the President (see next editorial) are now engaged, step by step, in betraying the nation into war. It is dishonest business, and we despise it as much as we fear it.

HANDLING THE FOREIGN SITUATION!

"Most Democrats here are relying on the President's handling of the foreign situation to keep them in power another four years."

This sentence marks the climax of a Washington dispatch to the Boston *Herald,* from its correspondent, Henry Ehrlich, describing the rather parlous plight of the Democratic Party in this campaign. It is a sentence well calculated to make shivers run up and down one's spine. For what is this "foreign situation"? It is the supreme tragedy of history—a war in which millions of men are destined to be slaughtered, and tens of millions of men, women, and children to be devoured by famine and pestilence, a war in which nations are being destroyed, and civilization may be smashed beyond the repair of centuries, a war which at this moment marks a higher tide of human misery than anything that Europe has known since the fall of the Roman Empire. And it is this situation, compact of tears and blood, of despair and death, which we are told that Mr. Roosevelt is preparing to manipulate in the interest of the Democratic Party and his own reëlection in the impending campaign! The thing would be unbelievable were it not for the fact that the President began handling this foreign situation in just this way more than a year ago. The way to prove himself "indispensable," of course, was to scare the people to death—to bring war right to these shores, and get the nation up to its ears in preparedness. The war-scare business was launched early with the President's silly and utterly unfounded talk about mysterious submarines off our coast. It continued steadily to the absurd climax of airplane attacks upon America from a Greenland base. Absurd or not, this sort of alarm-bell agitation was effective, and now, thanks to the White House, the people are jittery with fear. But suppose this is not enough—that Mr. Willkie, in spite of everything, shows signs of capturing the country! Then, says none other than Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, "we will be in it [the war] before the end of September." This, of course, would insure Mr. Willkie's defeat. Whether such a charge as this latter has any basis, we cannot say. But it is a perfectly logical climax of a policy of "handling the foreign situation" to keep the administration "in power another four years."

A WAY TO STOP IT!

We have little sympathy for the present French government. We believe its members were Fascists before as well as since the war. We regard its action in putting Daladier, Reynaud, and others on trial for taking France into this war a shameless attempt to find the scapegoat for France's ills. Nevertheless, we cannot help feeling that, apart from the persons and circumstances involved, this is a good thing—*to put on trial the makers of wars!* The Outlawry of War idea was based on the supposition that war, long since recognized by the conscience of mankind as a sin, should henceforth be regarded as a crime. Outlawry might well have been implemented by a provision setting up the machinery for the trial, condemnation, and bitter punishment of any king, president, premier, fuehrer, or ducé taking his people into war. If Daladier and company are convicted and imprisoned for life, as now seems probable, it may be unfair so far as these particular persons are concerned, but everlastingly wholesome so far as the precedent is concerned. Let every statesman in every country operate with the knowledge that an act of war may mean trial, imprisonment, or even death, and we venture to prophesy that the war rate will go down amazingly. Which reminds us of another sure way of stopping war!—a constitutional provision that every legislator who votes for war shall by reason of that fact alone be conscripted into the army and sent forthwith into the front line. These senators and representatives are just the ones who are never called upon to fight. Now let it be ordained that they shall by law be nominated as the first called upon to fight—and we shall have no wars! The same principle applies to conscription acts. Has anybody noted the interesting fact that the Burke-Wadsworth Bill, providing for compulsory military training, and of course compulsory fighting when war comes, specifically exempts officers of government from its provisions? Why should officers of government be thus relieved of the duty imposed upon other citizens? For the same reason, we suppose, that officers of government are the first to evacuate a city when the enemy appears. These officers must be saved, though everybody else perish! Well, we think we could get along without them. In any case, we would have them conscripted *first!* For then we know that no conscription law would ever pass.

LIQUOR AGAIN!

The liquor question is very much to the fore again these days. It was settled, you know, by the repeal of the 18th Amendment! We should never hear of it again, except as the taxes on "booze" swept untold millions of dollars into the treasury to balance the budget. But constantly it is bobbing up, like a ghost that will not be laid—or an evil that has not been conquered! Thus, bootlegging, which was lightly attributed to prohibition, is still with us. The other day the largest illicit still in the history of the country was uncovered by federal agents. In the same way the saloon question will not down. It will be remembered that the 18th Amendment was repealed on the express promise that the saloon, which had done so much to

bring prohibition in, would never come back again. Well, Mrs. Ida B. Smith, President of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, has just pointed out that in this country today there is one saloon for every seventy-one families, two saloons for every one church, five saloons for every three public schools, and three dollars spent for liquor against every two dollars spent for education. In this fact Mrs. Smith finds one explanation of the rapid growth of the Union—36,000 new members in 1939! On the day following Mrs. Smith's statement, both the New York *Times* and the New York *Herald-Tribune* published long editorials attacking and ridiculing the war against liquor. Both newspapers agreed that prohibition is dead; but it is elementary, is it not, that great metropolitan journals do not use valuable space on their editorial pages these days discussing dead issues. What concerns them is their beer and whiskey "ads" which cover whole pages of space sold at high rates. At this same time comes news from Canada that "booze" has become a serious menace to the war effort of the Dominion. (Curious, how a country gets excited about liquor the moment a life-and-death crisis appears! One would think it a sound argument that, if liquor is fatal to the national welfare in wartime, it is fatal also in peacetime.) What the Dominion will do seems not to have been determined, but rigorous restriction, if not out-and-out prohibition, is evidently on the way. And here's news from Europe! Nazi Germany has started a drive against beer, in favor of a non-alcoholic substitute; and France is declaring that wine-bibbing must stop, as the new France is going to be sober. "Something effective must be done," says *Zion's Herald,* "to combat the liquor menace." We agree—and prophesy that something will be done.

BELIEVE IT OR NOT!

Has this country gone mad with the war jitters? *Listen!* New York engineers are surveying subway routes with the idea of building air-raid shelters for the populace of the Greater City. * * * Bruce Bliven, of the *New Republic,* estimates that "we shall be lucky if we get as much as a year in which to prepare" against a Hitler invasion. * * * While engaged in rescuing a little boy from a jammed revolving door, a Boston fireman donned a gas-mask. * * * Recently Secretary of War Stimson gave out statements about eighty-one "foreign agents" apprehended near the Panama Canal. In the panic of investigation which followed, it was found that these "foreign agents" were all innocent refugees. * * * When the Citizens' Keep-America-Out-of-War Committee held a peace rally at Soldier Field in Chicago, the Chicago *Daily News,* a hitherto reputable paper owned by Secretary of the Navy Knox, described the meeting as "organized by Nazi agents." * * * Wythe Williams, in a hectic radio broadcast, declared that Nazi spies are now among us disguised as restaurant waiters, elevator boys, and filling-station attendants. * * * Major-General Hugh A. Drum, in charge of army maneuvers, issued a training memorandum calling attention to fifth-column activities and cautioning commanders to be on their guard against fictitious orders issued by Nazis. * * * A small suitcase, resting peacefully on the front porch of the home of Judge Joseph L. Smith, of Newark, was seized by the police, and examined by fluoroscope which revealed wiring and cogwheels within. Soaked in water, and ripped to shreds by machine-gun fire, the bag was found to contain not a bomb, but a motion-picture projector! * * * Scientists in New York have shipped certain rats, precious for experimental purposes, out of New York to the state of California, lest the rats be destroyed by Nazi bombing of the metropolis. * * * The Navy Department is considering plans for making Newport a "Gibraltar" to guard New York. * * * A Boston *Herald* reporter expresses "alarm" over the slow progress of construction of the great new army air-base at Chicopee, Massachusetts, lest "enemy machines may soon sweep over blunt-nosed Mt. Tom, to bomb the highly industrialized Connecticut valley region." * * * Lexington, Massachusetts, has organized a group of modern "Minute Men" to help "defend the nation." * * * At Kennebunk Beach, Maine, a Japanese taking a snapshot of the pretty Kennebunk River, navigable by rowboats, power-boats and canoes, was reported to the sheriff by an excited summer resident. * * * So it goes! "What fools these mortals be"!

Crosses in France

We, your sons, by the Marne and the Meuse
Lying so still in the moon's dim light,
Ask you why, in those dreadful years,
You sent us forth into war's black night?
You have reaped your harvest—remorse and tears,
And we, who challenged the roaring guns,
Here are lying—death stopped—
Your sons.

We, your sons, knew not why we went.
We were so young, but you bade us go
Over the seas where the rockets flared.
There we found them, the mighty foe.
Our eyes we closed, our breasts we bared
To the lads you called the fiendish Huns.
Then came the night, and sleep—
For your sons.

Long the years since the dark came down.
Peace was the goal, but above our graves
War still rages; the spirit of hate
Rules the land which the bright Marne laves.
Terror reigns in the halls of state.
It was for peace—our strife—our fate! . . .
Why do we hear the thunder of guns—
We who are lying here—
Your sons?

THOMAS CURTIS CLARK

A Crack in the White Wall

MORTON M. BERMAN

[NOTE: Richard Wright's sensational novel, *Native Son,* has brought to national attention the problem of our neglected, repressed, and oppressed Negroes in northern cities. Here is an authoritative study of the situation in Chicago, which is the scene of Mr. Wright's novel. Similar conditions prevail in other great centers of population. The author of this article is the Rabbi of Temple Isaiah Israel in Chicago, and Chairman of the Commission on Intercommunity Relationships of the Hyde Park-Kenwood Council of Churches and Synagogues.—*Editor.*]

A handful of socially-minded white neighbors decided to take a peek through a crack in the white wall which surrounds the Black Ghetto that stretches south from 26th to 63rd Streets on Chicago's South Side and east from Wentworth Avenue to Cottage Grove. These white neighbors were members of a Commission appointed by Chicago's Hyde Park-Kenwood Council of Churches and Synagogues to study the negro community and report back to its annual School of Religious Living.

We in Chicago discovered on the other side of Cottage Grove 200,000 negro souls crowded into an area which normally should hold no more than half that number. These 200,000 live in small, rickety, frame cottages along the railroad tracks built before the great fire, in high-grade residential residences on the former palatial Grand Boulevard, or in apartments on Michigan Avenue totally unadapted for a low income group. These Negroes often live four and five in a room, which, when it has some form of cooking equipment, is called a "kitchenette." Often a number of families share a common kitchen and a common toilet. This is called "doubling-up." Sometimes "doubling-up" does not mean two families in an apartment but as many as four and five in an apartment of six or seven rooms ordinarily intended for one family.

Average rent in this area is calculated at $33 a month per unit. It is important to realize that in many cases a unit represents only one room. But 95 per cent of the apartments at average rent are described as substandard. This means that they lack either one or all of the following facilities: central heating, gas, electricity, unshared kitchen, and/or a complete private bath.

People who have read *Native Son* by Richard Wright may have been shocked by the discovery that Bigger Thomas' family paid eight dollars a week for a kitchenette, a one-room rattrap with a makeshift kitchen. Chicago's South Side is full of this dominant design for living. The kitchenette is a big money-making proposition for Chicago's landlords; first, because the negro family is much smaller than is generally suspected (that is not hard to understand when we see the places in which their children are born and die), and second, because even if the Negro wanted more space in which to live, he has not the income with which to pay for it. He therefore must take whatever he can get and he is happy enough to get the kitchenette in the chopped-up second-hand dwellings or even in the abandoned office or lodge buildings, such as the old Pythian Building, which have been converted for the same purpose. The usual ugly conditions of extreme overcrowding, lack of decency and sanitation, absence of modern facilities, and physical deterioration are present in nearly all of these rattrap homes.

Health and Building Commissioners are responsible for failure to enforce the laws that would improve sanitary conditions, but some social workers insist that if the authorities acted too stringently, too many houses would have to be demolished and that there would then be even fewer houses in which Negroes might live. Garbage disposal authorities, by their utter neglect of the area, contribute in large measure to the unhealthy condition which exists on Chicago's South Side. The real problem appears to be the lack of possibility of expansion. "Restrictive covenants" have made it impossible for the Negro to get out of his ghetto. The great white wall has made the Negro Belt his Pale of Settlement. The Bigger Thomases must stay where the white man says they "belong."

It becomes rapidly more uncomfortable to stay in the negro area for a number of reasons. One of these is the increase in population. In 1900 there were 30,150 Negroes in Chicago. In 1934 there were 236,000. It is now estimated that there are 300,000. The white folks generally are not becoming more kindly about letting them out of their ghetto. The white folks include the University of Chicago and lay and religious leaders of the community whose excuse, among others, for signing "restrictive covenants" is that they do not want education to be impaired by the reduction of the University endowments through the loss of property values. They also include a University Professor whom the Negroes had vainly hoped to be their savior. But most hostile of all to the lifting of "restrictive covenants" are owners of property who are eager to protect their realty interests. Within the area itself it becomes increasingly more uncomfortable because of the demolition of homes. Twenty-seven hundred dwelling units were destroyed between 1934-37 with no new construction or even repairs to speak of made to existing structures during the same period.

Two recommendations are urged by our Commission, one of these is for increased Federal Housing, the other for rehabilitation of homes through the use of private capital. At present the Ida B. Wells Federal Housing project is under process of completion, after a terrific struggle against landlords and politicians. The Ida B. Wells project is, of course, but a beginning, as it will take care of only 1,700 families, but it is a significant beginning, and the community must continue to fight for additional Federal Housing. Efforts are being made to persuade individual landlords to rehabilitate some of the private homes. It has been pointed out that rehabilitation would mean not only a better community, but may even prove profitable to the landlords themselves. A visit made by the members of the Commission to scores of well-kept garden homes in the South Side area revealed that Negroes can keep their homes as clean, orderly, and well-tended as any other people if given the chance. If eager landlords are aided with capital at low interest rates by banks that are

loaded with it, innumerable negro homes could be rehabilitated and made available as decent living quarters, so that negro men, women and children will not have to live in "stinking garbage dumps" as Ma Thomas describes her one-room home.

Health does not thrive in such miserable quarters as just described. The wretched housing of the Negro accounts in large part for his health conditions, as well as for most of the problems that confront him. For every tubercular case on the east (white) side of Cottage Grove there are ten cases on the west (black) side. For every case of infant mortality on the east side of Cottage Grove there are two cases on the west side. For every white case of syphilis there are three black cases. But one does not have to be a medical expert to understand that where there is a lack of beds in a room and no chance for segregation there is bound to be a spread of contagion and infection. There is one happy factor that may be noted, and that is that the death rate among black maternity cases is only slightly greater than that among white maternity cases, but that is accounted for by the fact that the majority of maternity cases on relief, whether black or white, are treated in hospitals. For the benefit of those who think that the Negro is just a carefree, happy-go-lucky person, it may be suggested that our study revealed that insanity was high in all negro areas of the Chicago Black Belt. The Bigger Thomases do break under the stresses and strains of the white man's making.

It is hard for Negroes to get well if they have tuberculosis. No private sanitarium will take them; rarely are they treated in private hospitals. Only advanced cases of tuberculosis are treated at the County Hospital. Oak Forest Sanitarium also discriminates. Only recently have efforts to correct vicious discrimination at the Municipal Tuberculosis Sanitarium been successful.

Though Negroes represent today 10 per cent of the population of the nation, their doctors and dentists constitute a disproportionately small number. As one of their leaders put it to me recently: "Negroes are dying out of dentistry and medicine all over the country because it is made so difficult for them to study or to practice." In Chicago, Northwestern University Medical School and Rush Medical College bar Negroes from medical training. The University of Chicago and the University of Illinois admit a few under pressure. At Loyola, negro students are rare, although there and at Northwestern there are Negroes on the staff. The same difficulty exists as far as the training of nurses is concerned. Provident Hospital, a negro institution, trains negro nurses; Cook County Hospital and Bobs Roberts Hospital give them special training but nowhere else do negro nurses get any training. As far as negro internes are concerned, they are limited to two hospitals in the city of Chicago, to Provident and to Cook County.

A little more generosity is displayed toward patients. They are, of course, all admitted at Provident; they are segregated at St. Luke's. Private patients are put in isolation rooms. At Cook County they are received without discrimination; at Michael Reese and Passavant, Negroes are received in public wards only. In the less important hospitals, a few Negroes are admitted, only if the patient is dying, or in the rarest instances.

The focus of contagion which the Black Belt represents is not going to be cleared up until the housing conditions are altered. But along with better housing the Negroes need better and more food, better and more health care; they need more hospitals, they need more and better trained medical service. They are not going to have more and better doctors until our medical schools admit their young men and women to study, and until our hospitals invite them to serve as internes and train their young women as nurses.

Our Commission found 56 per cent of the Negroes out of work, 75,000 of them dependent upon relief, and 40,000 on WPA. The Negro, as is well known, gets the most menial job, is hired last, and is the first to be fired when bad times come. Right now in Chicago he is still waiting to be hired back. The Negro has made some advance in certain occupational fields like brick and stone masonry, carpentering, painting, plastering, in the manufacturing and mechanical industries, and in the field of public service. But he is still discriminated against by certain unions, particularly A. F. of L. unions. Recent years have seen the Negroes in Chicago joined by many unskilled workers from the South. The mechanization of farming and the plight of the sharecropper have driven many rural Negroes northward as they have driven the Joads westward to California. These Negroes have to wait three years before they can get on relief in Chicago. How they survive during the three years of waiting is both a mystery and a miracle. Prejudice makes it twice as hard for the Negro to get a job even when he is fitted for it. So he goes on relief or WPA if he can. Once on it, he remains on it until he is thrown off.

The same disorder and anarchy that run through the whole social and economic setup of the Negro Belt appear in the field of education. Here, too, we find that the basic evil is overcrowding. Thirteen of the fourteen Chicago schools which operate on a double-shift plan are negro schools. This means that 76 per cent of the negro children spend less time in school than do other children. With this condition it is impossible for negro children to get as much preparation for High School, trade school, or normal school, as they would get in full-time schools. Their handicap is further increased by the fact that the percentage of inexperienced teachers is much higher in negro schools than in other schools of the city. For white teachers use these negro schools as steppingstones to other schools, remaining at them often only a month or two before obtaining their transfers. This means that the normal teacher-pupil relationships cannot be established, and learning is interrupted.

A way of solving the problem of overcrowding in the negro schools was recommended by Mr. George McCray of the Better Schools Committee who urged the redistricting of schools, but this was opposed by the "restrictive covenant" groups supported by the Chicago Real Estate Board and the University of Chicago. Mr. McCray wrote:

> These covenants and their sponsors have made it impossible to maintain a decent community and wholesome domestic surroundings in which little colored children can develop into normal American citizens. Moreover, these same covenants have greatly frustrated the efforts of the school system to give these children a fair chance to acquire the rudiments of an education. There seems to be an unwritten but rigidly enforced law that no negro children living in areas set aside for Negroes will be permitted to attend schools located in areas which private individuals have restricted to whites. . . . Of these covenants, only the Ghetto in Czarist Russia in which Jews were forced to live was more destructive to a people than restrictive covenants are to Negroes.

A wise citizenry should understand how important it is to give to this blighted area a full, extensive educational program. This is not only necessary because negro boys and girls fail to go on with their High School and their normal school work, due to poor prep-

aration, but because negro boys and girls are failing to adjust themselves to life. There are increasingly too many Bigger Thomases. Crime and delinquency grow apace, and why not? When boys and girls have but half a day with which to occupy themselves in studying, when they have no homes to which to return, when there are no places where to play, when there are no real opportunities for recreation, education should be understood as a primary force for American citizenship. Schooling in Chicago's South Side is just a time killer, and at that, not very much time is killed.

The Commission studied the subject of the lack of law enforcement on the South Side, though no great research was required to be convinced that it existed. After we had surveyed the housing conditions we already knew how health and fire regulations were being neglected. But we understood that in many instances they were being neglected because their enforcement would have necessitated the demolition of the houses themselves. From our study we discovered that prostitution and the solicitation of prostitution are not only very common but are carried on brazenly and in every part of this area, oftentimes in dwellings where the most respectable people reside. We discovered that taverns not only committed the usual violations as to hours of closing but encouraged over-indulgence, operated near schools, and enticed children to come in and buy drinks.

But most serious of all was the problem of gambling. This was a vice in which the whole community shared, sapping virtually its life-blood. In Chicago's Black Belt there are 4,100 "policy" stations. This is no guess and everybody knows about them, including the Mayor, the State's Attorney, and the Commissioner of Police. For they have all been informed, but nobody does anything about them. Vice in Chicago, or elsewhere, is too profitable a source of revenue to too many ward-heelers and petty politicians to be easily eliminated.

In Chicago's South Side there are other reasons why vice is popular. Congestion brings it. Economic insecurity and drabness contribute to it. Bigger Thomases from the rural area adopt the behavior patterns of the urban blacks. But the political situation is not the least important factor. Wherever there are jobs to be given, wherever there is protection to be provided, wherever there is graft to be had, there is vice. Chicago's Black Belt is a gold mine for the politicians, even if it is a cesspool for its negro inhabitants.

We have already had tangible and measurable proof that it pays to urge the white folks to take a peek through the crack in the white wall that separates them from their negro neighbors. That proof lies in the great enthusiasm that has been evoked by the newly organized campaign which the Chicago Urban League has undertaken to curb crime and delinquency among youths of the neighborhood. To get the coöperation of the state and city authorities the Urban League has appealed to churches, synagogues, and social agencies in the city. It has not been so difficult to get the moral support of these groups since their conscience has been aroused by the recent survey of the Hyde Park-Kenwood Commission study. Churches, synagogues, as well as other groups, have petitioned the Mayor, State's Attorney, Commissioner of Police, *et al,* for their help in fighting crime in the negro area. The consequent offer of the Commissioner of Police to provide a squad of plain clothesmen to coöperate with the Urban League to supply police protection and perhaps even recreational guidance for youngsters who may be tempted to go into crime is a sample of the results that may be achieved when religious and social groups are aroused to action. The Urban League officials are, however, bitter in their complaints over the fact that they are receiving little coöperation or assistance in providing jobs for negro citizens or better homes for negro families as a real and lasting remedy for them. But what has been done in the field of crime illustrates what may be done in other fields when public conscience is stirred. It may well be that what began as a seasonal project in religious living will become an incipient crusade directed toward the solution of the terrifying problems that reduce the vitality and destroy the morale of the negro community.

There is a big job to be done on Chicago's South Side. It is a job for democracy. The Negroes do not want to be treated as inferior nor do they want to be patronized. They want an equal chance at what America has to offer. There is a crack in the white wall. Kindly white neighbors have taken a look and have seen an area filled with shadows of death and disease, despair and destruction made by white men. And they know that as long as men permit a wall of prejudice to stand within their own hearts against the Negroes, that greater white wall without will hold back the forces of religion and democracy from going to work to improve the lives of their black neighbors.

The Oneness of All Souls

I belong to the ages,
As the fruit to the tree;
What budded before time
Now ripens in me.

I am nothing apart
From the ancientest man,
What runs in my blood
In his blood once ran.

I inherit his being,
His glory, his shame;
The ashes of him
In me are a flame.

By a law universal,
By nature's decree,
Down the ages mankind
Has been toiling for me.

The thoughts man has cherished,
His learning, his art—
Through them has been nourished
The strength of my heart.

The blood of the race
Flows now in my veins;
I am richer by far for
Its struggles and pains.

I blame not its failures,
I scorn not its sin;
Above good and evil
There is wisdom to win.

Looking back down the ages
I am forced to foresee
That the future of man
Is waiting in me.

VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH.

America's Choices Narrow Down

THOMAS K. SAMPSON

[NOTE: The writer of this article, which is released by the *Nofrontier News Service,* is a journalist of considerable experience in European affairs, who employs a pen name for his protection in further work abroad. What he has to say must be judged on its intrinsic merits.—*Editor*]

Americans as a people are faced, in view of the Nazi victory over France, with a choice primarily between two courses. We can join in the war on Britain's side, or we can urge a settlement, obtaining the best terms possible by our mediation if accepted, and exact after the settlement everything we can by our economic power that will safeguard democracy in Europe and the Americas.

A third course of action may seem feasible: to lend aid to the British, short of actual participation in the war with manpower. But such a decision would put us into the war, whatever the degree, and would undertake the responsibility of encouraging Britain to fight on.

Suppose we decide to do this; or openly enter the war; or find that a rapacious Hitlerism refuses to allow Britain to make a tolerable peace? Short of a speedy victory for the Nazis, which at the moment does not look feasible, all Hitler's miracles notwithstanding, that war may be a veritable thirty years' conflict, making a desert out of Europe and destroying a civilization already fast breaking down under the stresses of war itself, or of a wartime economy which is only slightly less destructive.

Nazi weaknesses are obvious, and should not be overlooked just because everything has gone so well for their armed forces. Their machines are worn; their railroads are short of essentials not to be stripped from their victims without cost to themselves; they can no more escape the hardships and internal collapse universally experienced by victors in war than could the lands which conquered them in 1918. But they have conquered enough gasoline, industrial raw materials, foodstuffs, and productive machinery and plants, so that they can for a long time withstand any blockade or any retaliatory *blitzkrieg* that may slowly be built up against them. At best the British can only hope to stand firm on the defensive, in the hope that prolonged resistance may wear out the German war momentum.

If we enter the conflict, thus prolonging it nobody knows how long, the war will be eventually a war of the United States against Germanized Europe, with such help as Britain can give us. That is a fact, no matter what kind of pride it hurts, or on whose part.

Americans will then have to submit to a regimentation fully as great as that which has become the order of the day in Britain. And not for creative reasons or objectives; not for the production of the things that might make a thriving, strong internal democracy, such as housing, health, expansion of natural resources for human needs; but for the gangrenous decay of war, leaving only weakness in its wake. The first victim of that choice will be the very democracy we are bent on saving. If it be contended that the loss of freedom, civil rights, progressivism, advances in the social services, will be merely temporary, it can be argued on the other side that in a long war they are likely to be destroyed. The result of such wars in the past has inevitably been the triumph of dictatorship over democracy—dictatorship either from without, or from within. Our entire hemisphere will become a citadel; the gains we have laboriously made in our relations with a still-suspicious Latin America will have to be subordinated to the claims of a dictatorial foreign policy from the United States, and we shall emerge into a bankrupt, broken world, without a single great power left capable of succoring a shattered human order.

If any reader believes that Hitler can and will speedily consolidate his victory, maintain permanent territorial and economic conquest over all of Europe, *once he faces the special challenges of restored peace,* he is of course entitled so to think. But he will have the burden upon him of refuting a vast horde of facts that stare such defeatism in the face. Those who hold to this over-inflationary view of Hitlerism may hold that if we *do not* go to war with Great Britain against the Nazis, this hemisphere will have to remain armed to the teeth against attack. That might be the case if it were the only thing left for us to do. Emphatically it is not.

It may seem the only thing in the eyes of British political leaders, and, if so, they can be forgiven for it in view of the terrible dilemma in which they now find their country. Yet in spite of our affection for British institutions, many of which deserve the faith of mankind, the horrible record is there to see. If the British cannot be blamed for being insufficiently militarized, as they ought not, they can nevertheless be criticized for going into war in such a condition, and dragging in after them a whole long list of nations, of which France is now the last to suffer, and the United States the leading candidate for next place in the line.

Our minds, which have been stretched so wide and so unpleasantly fast, must bear more stretching still. Detest all we must and all we ought the state of mind revealed in Hitlerism, that state of mind is in the world and will have to be lived with. It is, alas, not confined to the places where it is now most dangerous. If victorious war could not crush it in 1918, victorious war will not crush it permanently in 1940 or 1945. Nor can we wage war on it for very long without succumbing ourselves to the very aspects of it we most abhor. Already the rise of the mob spirit within our frontiers is terrifyingly great. Racial hatreds are being nurtured by war-produced psychoses. Completely indiscriminate anti-foreigner agitation is becoming rampant. And just as we saw a wave of anti-Semitism grow out of the war mood in the years that followed 1918, we will see it again if we go into a drawn battle to eliminate it from the soil of Europe where it is most cruel. No country is immune from such poisons once the circumstances which foster them have been produced.

Does urging a halt to the war involve an acquiescence in Hitler's evil ways? Not at all! Without help from the United States, it is scarcely possible for Hitler to command the resources necessary for a successful re-ordering of his "new Europe." That is why post-

war Germany will seek American aid through a series of subtle bribes. One will be especially heavy for Americans to withstand: the offer to become a heavy customer when customers are going to be sorely needed for a profit-making business world. The instincts to which this bribe will appeal actually helped to build Hitler's air armada. Another bribe will possibly be—startling as the notion seems today—the appeal for coöperation in holding back bolshevism in Russia, this thesis coinciding with the hope, never abandoned by Hitler, of winning the Ukraine and achieving Balkan dominance. A third bribe will be a specious one though only so in part: that the permanent and sound way to restore the well-being of the millions of refugees and war sufferers in battered Europe, will be to get down to "normal business" as soon as feasible.

Need we agree to all of this? Not if we have the courage, sincerity, and determination to be stubborn. The cost will be heavy, but far less than that of war or perennial over-preparedness. We might find ourselves in a position where the Nazis would either heed our demands for more decency in international conduct, or run the grave chance of seeing their whole economic structure topple. We have never tried this weapon of defense in the past, partly because we have elected hitherto to deal coöperatively with Naziism, or have not been willing to submit to the regulatory procedures vital to success. Such a move as that of the President, for a cartel of trade representing the states of this entire hemisphere, contains implications far beyond those immediately discernible to the average business man.

If aid is forthcoming to Hitler's Europe, that aid should boldly and unequivocally ask a price. That price should be the next step toward a sane and restored Europe. Not so much the restoration of the old, capitalist imperialisms that have produced two European wars in one quarter of a century; not "the kind of civilization to which we have been accustomed." But a sufficiently stable and decent order through which to work for the changed relations out of which reconstruction can slowly, painfully proceed.

The one urgent, immediate policy for the United States, then, is mediation so far as practicable, coupled with economic defense. We need not relax any vigilance over Nazi propaganda, though we can and must place upon the tongues of those in high places the normal restraints of diplomatic interchange. We must state our case at all times in language that will find the ears of those who, in Germany, are not entirely hypnotized even now by the Fuehrer, and who may no longer be so universally cut off from the outside world. Deference should not be paid to the blackmailing tactics of a Mussolini, yet advantage might well be taken of the fact that his part in the war has been extremely unpopular, that he must pay a modicum of heed to the Pope, that he can be in the early future nothing but an increased economic drain on Hitler. If all this is less satisfying to our pride than a more heroic course, it is all the same a form of action most likely to relieve distress for millions in Europe, and to prevent collapse in which there is only the scantest hope of any constructive revolution toward democracy.

Can we in time snap out of our bewilderment, our bickerings, our frustrations, our fears? We owe it to a bleeding Europe, a Europe for which there can be no happiness at all in 1940 or 1941, but which could know futilely far worse horrors for many years to come. We owe it to what we deem most democratic and most fine in the American life that we can no longer take for granted; that we can kill at the very time when we are working most misguidedly to save it; that we can still, perhaps, use vigorously as intelligent people should to rescue what can be salvaged in this crashing world.

Humanism and the Present Religious Horizon

A. STIERNOTTE

Part III—Humanist Religion

After this brief survey of contemporary types of American religious thought, it is desirable to return to humanist religion and inquire into the specific characteristics which give it religious significance. A humanist church has sometimes been described by traditionalists as a mutual admiration society. If it is devoted to human welfare, they argue, how does it differ from any other society in which human values are maintained or extended, such as educational and medical institutions, research laboratories, movements devoted to the cause of peace or economic security, *et cetera?* Furthermore, can humanist religion withstand the assault of neo-supernaturalism? Is it wedded to a romantic view of human nature and of its improvement under scientific guidance, or does it dare to look at the world realistically and take into account the economic struggles and the international conflicts which make a "humanist way of life" well-nigh impossible for a large proportion of the race? Also, since religion, at least under the Christian tradition, has been linked to the concept of a personal God, can religion exist in its own right if it dispenses with that concept? What in short are the peculiar features of humanism to give it the significance of a high religion? These are fair questions and they must be answered more concretely than by repeating the arguments of nineteenth century rationalists against outmoded theological doctrines.

About ten years ago both theists and humanists felt that a cosmic reference would imply a return to theology. The theists therefore hunted for a reference to the cosmos in humanist writings, while the latter usually replied that the cosmic origin of human values was a problem for anthropologists and psychologists, not for religion. Now there has been a shift in position, for the empirical theists who believe not in a God beyond, but in a God apparent in the creative forces of the cosmos, are being driven into a corner by the supernatural theists, while at conferences of religious humanists the cosmic element in religion is again coming into prominence, without at the same time implying a return to the older theism. The need of this cosmic reference had already been perceived by Clarence R. Skinner in evaluating the "Humanist Manifesto," issued in 1933:

> Could there not be an emphasis upon "cosmic consciousness" so that Humanist religion might constantly stretch the imagination to universal proportions? After all, no matter how fallacious some of the theistic concepts may have

been, God stood for something Infinite, and worship kept open "the soul's east window of divine surprise," eliciting a cosmic consciousness. Must the followers of Humanism lose this aspiration toward fellowship with the universe? Our bodies are of the same stuff with the stars and with the earth. Can there not be a similar communion between man's mind and the totality of things? An anthropo-centric religion will miss something vast and profound if it does not try to enlarge the border lines of the human spirit beyond the relation of man to man. And it could be done without the concept of God. Perhaps the universe may no longer be interpreted in personalistic terms. But there is still a universe, and man must bear some relation to it.

The following is an attempt to set forth this cosmic reference in humanist religion as the distinctive element which makes it a religion and not merely a philosophical society, or a movement for social reform.

In the first place, humanist religion stresses the idea of "the planet having come to consciousness." It emphasizes the unique character of man as becoming more and more aware of his own evolution, and it relates that form of development to the natural processes of the universe so that there is an unbroken line of development from the inanimate world through the lowest forms of life to the highest human spirits. There is thus a profound kinship between nature and man, and the first characteristic of humanist religion is that it makes of this kinship a distinctly religious feeling. That is to say, an intellectual exposition of the meaning of this relationship in terms of the physical and social sciences would not be religion; but an emotional reaction which gathers into itself the full meaning of this relationship is religion. There are some sublime moments when we feel that the totality of life, all its strivings, aspirations, and achievements are rooted in the universe. When we feel this with such peculiar intensity that our individual selves are submerged in the totality of life, and the totality of life in turn submerged in the cosmos, we are part of a process which is greater than ourselves; we are possessed of this process in indissoluble unity, and it is difficult to say whether we live in it or it lives in us. Thus humanism claims to be a religion because it relates the highest human values to the cosmos out of which they have come, and in that relation finds life's supreme meaning. That experience of life in which we feel the universe coming to consciousness in us with peculiar intensity can never be evaded once it has been enjoyed. Years later it will arise again at the most unexpected moment and demand our unswerving loyalty. John H. Dietrich has beautifully expressed this fellowship with nature in his sermon "A Humanist Looks at Mysticism":

We become conscious of the life that flows through nature, and makes it like ourselves a living thing. We realize that as far back as our imagination can reach, this life force has been moving and changing and evolving into the myriad forms which make up the wonder of the world, and it is this same life force that energizes and inspires and lifts us. We are a part of the creative process. Out of the vital sources of the world we have emerged, and we move along in the great river of cosmic being. In us, as in nature, the life stream has found its way, and there is doing its work. We are but fragments in the boundless sweep of being, links in an infinite chain of existence. We are but concrete expressions of certain phases of nature. We flow from the eternal source, and are parts of the infinite whole, or as some one put it, we are "constituent drops in the cosmic flood, which lend their own creative impulse to the sweep of destiny."

The process of development from unconscious matter to consciousness may be considered from two aspects. The one just referred to involves relating man to nature, that is, we proceed from man to nature in an experience of nature mysticism. In the other aspect we proceed from nature to man and feel that his noblest ideals, his deepest devotion and consecration are the highest potentialities of the universe. In his book, *Frankness in Religion,* Robert J. Hutcheon puts it in this way:

In the infinite depths of the universe it may be that other creatures bring reality to a richer focus than man; but for us, at least, on our present level of experience and knowledge, the divinest thing known is our own humanity at its best. To the cry of the bewildered Job: "Oh that I knew where I might find him, that I might come even to his seat," the best answer is that celebrated saying of St. Chrysostom: "The true Shekinah of God is man." Our humanist friends are only repeating the truth of this great saying when they declare that the great world-spirit finds its highest expression in humanity, and that in humanity we must look for the deepest manifestation of the divine.

Humanist religion thus invests "the planet come to consciousness" with rich and profound meanings. Is not this high valuation placed upon human nature like that of the young philosopher grown lover to the lady of his love? Is he not wont to regard her as the manifestation and incarnation of what is deepest and highest in the universe? Religion, like love, makes the commonplace sublime, the daily task a work of consecration; and religion, like love, has sometimes that tragic quality in which it lives on through the intensity of its utter hopelessness.

The homage which humanity has given to its greatest representatives, the spiritual giants to whom national and ecclesiastical morality was far inferior to the demands of a high religion, would seem to rest on the conviction that here the creative forces of the universe have reached a peculiarly rich focus, a culminating point, a "summit character" to use an expression of H. N. Wieman, which reveals the unlimited possibilities of our humanity. By a strange paradox this spiritual eminence over the race is itself an indication of the possibilities of the race. And humanity has had the insight to find supreme greatness in a humble and lowly Nazarene, and to declare, in spite of the mass of theological doctrines under which he was nearly smothered, that there was more of the integrating process of the universe in him than there was in the scribes and the Pharisees, and the great and mighty of the earth. In him the life of the universe came to consciousness as the quality of selfless devotion to the ideal of love. By some strange attraction men have felt drawn to this incarnation of the spirit of love, and in their quaint theologies have tried to express the idea that he was the highest upreach of the evolutionary process. This high valuation placed upon Jesus throughout the ages is a most significant slap in the face of those religionists who have become enmeshed in the tangles of ecclesiasticism and institutionalism, who have taken the shadow for the substance, and who have invariably hounded their best spirits,—those smug, complacent people to whom the symbol of religion is a church, a doctrine, or a ritual, without the slightest deviation from the things which are "just not done"! They have never realized that the greatest symbol of religion is the unquenchable flame of the human spirit, regardless of tradition and convention! The life of Jesus is the eternal glory of humanity, his death the eternal shame of the "sons of them that slew the prophets." Shall not humanist religion pay tribute to this imperishable element in Christianity?

The second aspect of humanism by which it achieves the distinction of being a religion is therefore the fact that it sees in the highest representatives of the race a unique focalization of the qualitative and integrating

aspects of the universe. The older religious phraseology regarded man as a "child of God," the newer humanist phraseology regards man as a "child of nature." The rise of consciousness in a universe of unconscious forces and the emotional reaction which relates the world of personally conscious beings to the world of inanimate matter will always be the perennial problem and province of religion. Thomas Mann gives expression to this thought very beautifully:

> Have I said too much in saying that the human being is a great mystery? Whence does he come? He springs from nature, from animal nature, and behaves unmistakably after his kind. But in him nature becomes conscious of herself. She seems to have brought him forth not alone to make him lord over his own being—that is only a phrase for something with much deeper meaning. In him she lays herself open to the spiritual; she questions, admires, and judges herself in him, as in a being who is at once herself and a creature of a higher order.

A third element in humanist religion refers to its ethical basis. Since man represents nature at its highest level organization, it follows that human values are the supreme concern of humanist religion. Sensitive spirits in all ages have been quick to perceive their infraction and sometimes that perception has issued in flaming condemnation. In the prophet and the reformer, and even the revolutionary, there is that burning passion for righteousness, that flame of the human spirit which obeys only an inner compulsion and goes far beyond the common standards of respectability. That is why, strangely enough, the prophet has oftentimes met but poor treatment at the hands of his contemporaries, for he is bound to challenge their inferior standards of morality, and to them this challenge is a violation of these standards. And so with a strange consistency, the prophet and the criminal have been treated alike, history showing the gentle Nazarene dying on a cross between two thieves at the hands of the official representatives of religion—a tragedy which has imbedded itself upon the consciousness of men in spite of the many attempts to hide its essential meaning by making it appear theologically correct and planned "from the foundations of the world"!

We are not concerned at the moment whether or not the ideals of the prophet are immediately relevant and realizable in our society; it may well be that they are not and that vaster forces than he dreamed of will come into play. We are concerned, however, with the quality of his spirit, which in its traditional expression, cried out against man's inhumanity to man as being a transgression of the laws of a just God. There was thus a transference from the realm of human valuation to a higher and supernatural realm. It may be objected that humanist religion dispenses with the supernatural. How can, then, its ethics have a religious basis? They will have a religious basis because humanist religion will regard an act against human personality as an act against the universe which has produced that personality. Since, as argued above, the peculiarly religious character of humanism is its cosmic reference, an attack on the highest human values will be dramatized as an attack on the whole cosmic nexus in which man is involved. Thoroughgoing humanists may not regard this conception of ethics as philosophically correct, but the humanist whose mind is inflamed by the same passion as that of the traditional prophet will have moments of spiritual insight and intensity in which he will jump over the logical boundaries of his naturalistic philosophy and declare, as John Haynes Holmes once did, that a certain miscarriage of justice (now rectified) deranged the planets in their courses and that the universe must strive till it is whole again! Only religion can produce such an intense attitude, for it is the peculiar genius of religion to take an unjust act out of the circumstances of time and place where it has occurred, to raise it to a cosmic level, and to feel that the whole world order of man and nature is being impaired. Or to put the same thought in a positive way, the triumphs of humanity are the triumphs of the world order of man and nature, and the truly religious man will have moments of intensity in which he will gather the whole universe in a vision of a glorified humanity. If man in his deepest religious experience finds himself in such deep communion with nature that he no longer knows whether he is conscious of nature, or nature becomes conscious in him, then it follows that his sense of ethics will link human values with the cosmos out of which they have come.

Perhaps this presentation of a type of humanist ethics may seem to derive to a large extent from the Hebrew tradition. But there may be a possibility that humanism with its calm outlook on human affairs divorced from sectarian activity is just a little bit too impartial in viewing the human scene. Roy Wood Sellars seemed to sense this when he said, in the *New Humanist,* July-August, 1931: "We must wed Hebrew outspokenness with Greek intellect and our experimental touch."

The field of ethics of humanist religion must necessarily apply to the complex society in which we live, move, and have our being. The machine age has to a great extent depersonalized human relations so that the morality based upon the direct human contacts of a primitive agricultural society will have to be transferred to the many-sided industrial society of our day in which personalities are enmeshed in a thousand and one ways. An ethic which considers human progress through the "transforming friendship" ideal, as if society were made of a mere collocation of individuals like the atoms of nineteenth century physicists in a void, will be powerless to grapple with the rise of totalitarianism, the growth of force in human affairs, and the conditioning influence of an industrial civilization upon the behavior and motives of men. Does anyone suppose a benign smile will move Hitler to call back his battleships? This clearly means a shift of emphasis from the individual to the social conscience; and a redress of wrong not so much through the changing of individuals as through the social control of groups which wield too much power. The trend is towards a world community, a coöperative and socialized world order enhanced by the contributions of each national culture, and based on the essential predicate of democracy, the will to make our own destiny out of our own experience.

That is not to say that humanist religion will be able to provide a ready-made solution for social ills, or that it has the driving force to change the world. Human values are created by the life-process on this planet in its unquenchable urge to preserve and extend itself. Humanist religion is a reflection, an integration, a unification of these values, but not their creative agency—that belongs to Life itself. The technique of extending human values in their social relations is the province of the economist, the political thinker, the statesman, the reformer, and at times even their findings will be outstripped by the empirical facts of history. What humanist religion can do is to integrate, unify, and relate to the cosmos the values which the experience of the race has unearthed. As long as life exists it will

find meaning—for life will never turn back—though it may in times like the present strive to find that meaning in a sea of blood. Nevertheless the perennial task of religion remains, to relate the totality of human values to the universe out of which they have come, and in that emotional experience bring out life's supreme meaning. And since these values are becoming more social in character, the religious terminology will probably change from looking at man as a child of God to man as a child of nature, and finally to man as a child of the social process. And who knows but that a mystical experience will arise in which man will see himself as a contributing factor in a vast world movement tending towards economic security and the "more abundant life"? A mystical experience, be it noted, in the sense of emotional reaction to knowledge, not as knowledge obtained through other than rational means. And so man may again lose himself; and in that sense of unification with a social movement considered as a world process, he will again find himself.

The realm of humanist religion may be put somewhat differently if one uses the pragmatic philosophy of John Dewey. This philosophy ceases to strive "to put a little salt on the tail of the Absolute" in the words of Josiah Royce, but is content to evaluate the meanings which life brings forth out of experience. The patient search of the scientists for truth, the imaginative creations of the artist and the poet, the unrelenting devotion of the reformer to his cause, the deep experience of the mystic, the intellectual passion of the philosopher to find a unifying framework for the world process of mind and matter—these are some of life's meanings. Humanist religion did not create them, but it can appraise, criticize, and integrate them into an emotional world view of the "planet come to consciousness." In order to achieve this world view it can use a number of philosophies, for it is necessary and sufficient for the purposes of humanism that its philosophy shall consider the rise of higher forms of existence from lower forms in such a way that the higher cannot be reduced to the lower aspects but represent qualities which have emerged through some evolutionary process. Such a process of growth is given by the philosophies of empirical theism, creative evolution, emergent evolution, evolutionary naturalism, pragmatism, and dialectical materialism. Humanist religion may use any of these philosophies, but it could not very well use absolute idealism or mechanical materialism, the first because it denies the existence of matter, the second because it reduces higher qualities of reality to mechanical motions of matter.

But enough of this philosophy! It boils down to the conclusion that the more naturalistic philosophy becomes, and the more realistic man's social life becomes, the net result will be the linking of man to the universe out of which he has come in indestructible unity; and it is precisely this relationship which has been here set forth as the sure foundation of humanist religion. The temple of religion, especially in its Unitarian wing, has indeed broadened out to unpredictable vistas. W. H. Alexander of the University of California, who for more than twenty years valiantly acted as Unitarian minister in a none too receptive environment, in comparing denominations to fences has this to say of his colleagues, in *Queen's Quarterly,* Winter 1939-40:

> Personally (you must remember I speak as a confirmed Presbyterian) I think the Unitarian fence is pretty low; even a child could step over it. Indeed I just said that to my Unitarian friend as I was coming home with him one day at noon, and curiously enough he said that was just what he wanted, fence enough to mark a position, but low enough for a child to pass.

And why not, Dr. Alexander? At least a low fence would enable Unitarians to keep as close to the ground as possible, for are not some of them content to describe themselves as "children of Earth"? Rather let us say, as Dr. Alexander himself did in his beautiful meditation heard for many years with ever-recurring gladness and peace:

> Eternal spirit of our humanity, increased and nurtured by the constant efforts of men throughout all ages, may we be merged with thee as the dewdrop on the petal of the flower slips in the end into the bosom of the mighty sea.

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention.—*Editor.*]

XXI

The Independent Committee for Thomas and Krueger (Socialists) states:

> The so-called "anti-war" plank adopted by the Democratic Party at its National Convention will fool no one who has followed the record of the Roosevelt Administration. Hitler's successes have made it impracticable for an American *army* to be landed in Europe at this time. The President is well aware of this and is attempting to appease the "peace vote" by making a virtue of necessity.
>
> Far more serious at the moment, is the drive toward an armament economy and the move for national conscription. Having failed to solve our pressing economic problems at home, the Administration seeks to disguise this failure and to divert public attention by hysterical militarization. Already this drive has curtailed relief and social service appropriations and has threatened wage and hour standards (which are supposed to imperil defense!). These assaults can only succeed in an atmosphere of fear and exaggerated nationalism. The attempt to whip up an artificial "national unity" on this basis means the suspension, perhaps the death, of democracy at home.

Miss Muriel Lester, famous English non-resistant pacifist, speaking at a Christian Pacifist Conference held at Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ohio, said, as reported in the *Christian Century:* "Practical men said in 1919, 'We know Jesus said to feed your enemies, but that just doesn't work in this case.' They thought," she continued, "that they knew better than God. Today the world is reaping the harvest of hatred and revenge."

The War Resisters' International, with headquarters in London, England, announces the appointment of a new chairman, as follows:

> Laurence Housman has been appointed Chairman of the War Resisters' International in the place of George Lansbury. No man has undertaken so difficult a task with a greater spirit of humility. No one is better fitted to advise and guide our movement in these difficult days.
>
> Laurence Housman is celebrated as a dramatist, novelist, and poet. He is probably best known in Britain, France, and America by his two collections of plays, *Victoria Regina*

and the *Little Plays of St. Francis.* In the latter he used the character of St. Francis to express with a singular beauty and originality the principles and the practice of Christianity, or in other words of positive pacifism.

In public life Laurence Housman has always been associated with genuinely progressive movements. An ardent and active pro-suffragist during the campaign for extending the franchise in Britain to women, he became a pacifist during the last war and identified with Socialism and Irish Home Rule. Since 1930 he has been actively associated as a writer and speaker (and as president of the Friends of India) with the demand for Indian self-determination and self-government.

Laurence Housman has been an active coöperator in the work of the W.R.I. for many years. He was a constant speaker for the British No More War Movement and later, when that movement merged with the Peace Pledge Union, he became a Sponsor and Executive Member.

Speaking of its work in these troublous times, the War Resisters' International says:

George Lansbury said, "There are times when silence is golden." The International will know when to be silent and when to speak. Its message has been rejected; it will not repeat that message to ears which are deaf, but there are still many who will listen. In this testing time a few, a very few, have faltered. The International has no word of blame to utter. Let each serve where he believes he best can. "One day they will know that we were right." Pacifism is not a broken reed but a staff upon which men would not lean.

The War Resisters' International has a faith which by perils is undeterred. It consists of soldier-pilgrims who know how to fight. Our trusty blade is neither cannon nor bomb. We will destroy, not men, but wrong ideas. Let each serve as he knows best how.

Following an attack upon one of their number, for his peace utterances, by two members of the faculty of the University of Syracuse, twenty-two Protestant ministers of Syracuse, New York, united in the following public statement:

We, the undersigned, share the general concern of the American people as to the dangers now confronting our republic. Because we are concerned for the freedom of the pulpit in our community, we hold it of supreme importance that the clergy, together with other responsible citizens, should freely voice their considered judgments on the present international crisis, and that all the channels of public expression should be kept open to this use. This is the basic technique of democracy.

We have confidence in the great reservoir of calm judgment and unexpressed opinion in the minds of the American people, which, although unheard in the present clamor, remains our truest security.

We would counsel the citizens of Syracuse to a spirit of sanity and good judgment in the present time of national crisis. We stand opposed to the forces that seem eager to bring this country into war and which seem determined to cast a stigma upon the good names of peace-loving men. Because war is such a total contradiction of the gospel of Jesus Christ and so destructive of everything the church has proclaimed for 2,000 years, we believe there is great need in the church pulpit today, as well as in the forums of the community, for men who are brave to speak their patriotic and religious convictions in the face of relentless criticism and misunderstanding.

It is essential to remind ourselves that the steps by which totalitarianism came into power in other lands were the suppression of religious and civil liberties, universal military conscription in peacetime, and dependence upon a vast armament economy.

In view of the foregoing, we would affirm the following principles of belief and action:

1. To maintain the church as a house of prayer for all peoples. We dare not duplicate within the fellowship of Christ the antagonisms that now divide the world.

2. To aid and relieve to the best of our ability the victims of war in all nations alike.

3. To promote actively and continuously, as the first aim of our nation's foreign policy, the cause of peace and brotherhood.

4. To stand squarely opposed to step-by-step intervention in foreign wars, and to reaffirm our belief that we can save neither Europe, Asia nor ourselves by military means.

The New Testament was written in times like these. We therefore, reffirm our conviction that we dare not disregard in any human relationships the reconciling principles of the Sermon on the Mount.

We wish it clearly understood that we sign this statement as individual citizens, without commitment of any church or organization to the policies outlined herein.

An affirmation of the Christian minister's right to counsel and support persons who oppose conscription and refuse military service because of conscientious objection to war has been issued by one hundred and sixty-seven (167) leading Protestant clergymen of the country. The affirmation follows:

We desire to affirm our conviction that no action of government can abrogate or suspend our obligation as Christian ministers to counsel men in all circumstances to render obedience to conscience and resolutely to do the right as they see it. Therefore, we must make it clear to our fellow-citizens, and in particular to conscientious objectors to war in any form, that we stand ready to counsel and support in all ways within our power those who may be subjected to difficulty or persecution because they are unable conscientiously to coöperate in the operation of a conscription act.

Ministers signing this statement include Dr. Allan K. Chalmers of the Broadway Tabernacle Church in New York, Bishop W. Appleton Lawrence of Western Massachusetts, Rev. A. J. Muste, of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, Rev. John H. Lathrop of the Unitarian Church of the Savior, Brooklyn, Rev. Frederick K. Stamm, of Brooklyn, Rev. Cornelius Greenway, of the Universalist All Souls Church of Brooklyn, and the Editor of UNITY.

President Daniel L. Marsh, of Boston University, speaking at the Summer School commencement, denounced war as "the rule of jungle beasts." He said, in part:

If men are to be men, immortal children of God, then they must learn to act like men and not like animals. One of the distinguishing characteristics of man is that he has the power of acting upon his own nature, of guiding it and determining in large measure what it shall be. Man can choose his own ideals, and his ideals are his inspiration. By adherence to ideals high or low, man can elevate or degrade himself.

Just here is where education plays its most important part in a democracy. There is no rational occasion today for the war psychosis that is sweeping America. If there ever was a period when we needed an unhysterical leadership, it is now. One cries out in vain—it is like the voice of one crying in the wilderness—against the fomenting of war hysteria in this country.

No sensible person takes exception to a common-sense program of preparedness. The danger confronting us just now is that those who are whooping it up for war in the alleged defense of democracy shall succeed in the destruction of democracy.

The best defense of democracy is in the realm of the moral and spiritual nature. Educational institutions and churches are now faced with terrific responsibility. We must now keep alive the ideals of democracy.

The *Nofrontier News Service* publishes the following from London, England:

Ruling that it was illegal for an employer to dismiss from his job any person subject to the National Service Act, and that this included conscientious objectors, the Clerk of the Salford Corporation has opened up a whole field of inquiry which may extend far beyond the original community to the entire United Kingdom. It may also have bearing in the United States, should the latter adopt conscription. The ruling of the town authorities made it plain that those who refused to allow conscientious objectors to work who had properly met all requirements of the law, would be fined £50. The matter of how far this ruling can be used to cover cases which have arisen of war resisters being fired solely because of their sincere convictions, is being investigated by the Central Board for Conscientious Objectors.

Correspondence

Editorial Correction

UNITY Office:

Something went wrong, in the current issue, in your printing of my editorial on "The Third Term Tradition" (page 179).

As the editorial appears, two sentences read:

> Personally, we have always felt the tradition was wise and wholesome. As we look into our mind, we discover that our reaction toward the attempt to break the outrageous tradition is very much the same as was our reaction toward the attempt to pack the Supreme Court.

By some peculiar chance, that word "outrageous" got misplaced. The second sentence in the above should read:

> As we look into our mind, we discover that our reaction toward the attempt to break the tradition is very much the same as was our reaction toward the outrageous attempt to pack the Supreme Court.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Kennebunk Beach, Maine.

The Conscientious Objector

Editor of UNITY:

The present controversy over the necessity of instituting military training in peacetime, as provided for in the Burke-Wadsworth Bill now pending in Congress, has again raised the issue of the conscientious objector. While the American Civil Liberties Union sees no issue of civil liberty in conscription *per se*, it has concerned itself with the conscientious objector clause. Working with various religious groups and church leaders, the Union has proposed a definite procedure for dealing with conscientious objectors and a wider latitude for the term. The Union, in coöperation with other interested organizations, has proposed amendments to the pending legislation following very closely the methods which have proved so successful in Great Britain.

According to the plan suggested, all men who object to war or military service would be allowed to register as conscientious objectors. The present narrow definition limiting exemptions to members of recognized religious groups with a historical stand against war would be widened to include men with personal religious scruples but who belong to denominations that have taken no official stand on the question. It would also take into consideration those men with no religious ties but with strong ethical and humanitarian objections to military service. These cases, according to the provisions to be substituted for the usual regulations, would be handled by local boards of civilians. It is pointed out that military men are hardly qualified to judge the problem involving a point of view so contrary to their training and experience. These civilian boards, after determining the validity and sincerity of the applicant's objections, would be empowered to assign him to definite categories of service based upon the special aspects of each case. For some there would be non-combatant work under military authority. Other objectors would be utilized for civil work under the supervision of civilian agencies. Those with absolute objections to any coöperation in war would be granted complete exemption.

This effort to deal adequately and justly with all conscientious objectors has met with the approval of many religious leaders, Protestant, Catholic, and Quaker, who have taken varying stands on the whole issue of conscription. Among those who have already testified before House and Senate committee hearings on the bill were Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, of the Riverside Presbyterian Church in New York City; the Right Reverend W. Appleton Lawrence, the Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Western Massachusetts; James A. Crain, Executive Secretary, Department of Social Education and Social Action, Disciples of Christ; C. F. Boss, Jr., Executive Secretary of the General Conference Comm. on World Peace, Methodist Episcopal Church; and Paul C. French, representing the Friends General Conference.

Dr. Howard K. Beale, Professor of American History at the University of North Carolina, who presented the views of the A. C. L. U. and other proponents of this approach to conscientious objectors, declared:

> You can not conquer Hitlerism if you let it conquer you in the process. If at the first step we destroy liberty of conscience, you have already lost the battle for freedom. In Germany such freedom is impossible. In England it has been meticulously preserved in a draft law. I don't want to see America adopt Hitler's method. I want it to adopt the British and true American method.

This contention that the United States in peacetime cannot afford to be less liberal than Great Britain in the midst of a war, has impressed many people who were not concerned with the religious issue involved. A study of the results of the British method of dealing with conscientious objectors of all types contradicts most arguments that the scruples of an individual's conscience must be disregarded in a national emergency for the sake of common safety. The record shows that only one man in fifty has asked for exemption. The ratio of cases dismissed for unsatisfactory evidence is very small. It was also discovered that, as the war increased in frightfulness and cowards could be expected to seek exemption, the number of men who sought to take advantage of the law's generosity actually decreased. Those who refuse combatant service are not being wasted in prison as in the last war; their genuine contribution to the nation's welfare has been recognized. The morale of the people as a whole was certainly not weakened by this evidence of genuine democracy on the part of a government that called on them to protect freedom.

PROF. EDWARD A. ROSS
Chairman, National Committee
REV. JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
Chairman, Board of Directors
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

More About "Communist Confusion"

Editor of UNITY:

I read with great amazement and shocked incredulity your editorial, "Communist Confusion," in the June 17th issue of UNITY, which has just been brought to my attention. I hasten to point out to you several gross misstatements of fact in the paragraph from the report which you quoted and on which your conclusions were based, and to request that, in the interest of truth and justice, you make some amends for having given an erreoneous and injurious impression, by inserting in your next issue a statement of correction.

In the first place, the obvious falsehoods contained in the section of the report you quoted, which we shall proceed to point out, lead to a very grave doubt as to the sincerity and motives of the authors of the report whose source is not given.

1. There is no substantiation whatsoever of the bald statement that "The original Communist-dominated organization was the Medical Bureau to Aid Spanish Democracy."

2. The American Friends of Spanish Democracy was never incorporated into the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy.

3. The Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign was not "a new organization" formed in April, 1939, but was the new name adopted by the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy to indicate the changed character of its work.

4. The Socialist and Communist Party representatives were not asked to drop out at that time. Their withdrawal came about voluntarily at the suggestion of the Communist Party representative.

5. The crisis which was precipitated in the organization in March, 1940, was not over "unauthorized statements . . . issued from the Campaign's offices" nor "when . . . Communist members ordered the picketing of the French Consulate," but rather when by a slight majority of eleven to nine the executive board of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign refused to approve the decisions of the Pan-American Conference on Aid to Spanish Refugees, held in Mexico City, February 17 to 20, which it had initiated and to which it had sent three delegates.

6. The so-called "unauthorized statements . . . issued from the Campaign's offices" were in fact issued by executive staff members of the organization, the campaign director, and the organizational secretary, and were in keeping with the established policy of the organization.

7. The picketing of the French Consulate was not ordered by any members of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign but was instituted by and under the auspices of the Emergency Conference to Save the Spanish Refugees, an organization formed under the leadership of Spanish organizations in New York City for the purpose of taking such action as was deemed necessary to save the Spanish refugees in danger of being sent back *en masse*. Members of the executive board of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign did, however, protest the action of the executive secretary of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, in issuing a statement to the press dissociating

the organization from the picketing *and* calling those who did picket to task for doing so.

8. The "national body" was, indeed, "wrested" from control of the large body of supporters and active workers for the organization throughout the country as has subsequently been proved by the adhesion of all the former chapters of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, with but one exception, to the new organization which was formed on the basis of adhering to the program adopted at the Mexico City Conference. This control was obtained by extremely devious means such as a last minute announcement by a group of members of the executive board that they would not attend a regularly called meeting after they had indicated in writing that they would be present, so that they could arrange another meeting at their convenience packed with several of the board who, although they had been members for many months, had not previously attended a single meeting. At this meeting the desired action was railroaded through in a most undemocratic manner without allowing the decisions to be discussed for more than a few moments.

9. The New York Chapter of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign (and here the assertion that it was in Communist hands is again entirely unfounded) was never at any time called the Emergency Conference to Save Spanish Refugees.

10. Finally, and most shocking, an obviously erroneous statement, as anyone can discover who cares to make an unprejudiced investigation, is the assertion that Dorothy Parker's Spanish Children's Relief Fund sprang up over night. That Fund has been in existence for at least two years and its connection with the United American Spanish Aid Committee (for a brief period the North American Spanish Aid Committee) has been approved very definitely and clearly by Dorothy Parker, herself, whose reputation and sincerity cannot be questioned.

Without questioning your right to have and to express your opinions as you may wish, it seems clear from the foregoing that in this case the conclusions you stated editorially are based on a section of a report which contains many misstatements and therefore hardly prove the point you wish to make. On the contrary, that very fact lends weight to the charge that "red-baiting, purging, and unAmerican practices generally" are only too frequently indulged in as a means of obtaining freedom to prosecute a special cause "without interference."

We trust that, in the light of the facts we have pointed out, you will take such steps as we have requested to rectify the injury done so that the readers of your publication may have possession of the truth in this case.

EDWARD K. BARSKY,
Chairman.

[NOTE: The editorial above challenged was based upon a careful, published report in which we had the fullest confidence. The statements here contradicted were all statements quoted from this report. We have here a frank difference in testimony from two opposing groups. We are glad to publish this letter, as we believe that everybody should have a right to speak and bear testimony as to his cause. But we still believe in and trust the report on which our editorial was based.—*Editor.*]

Emma Goldman

Editor of UNITY:

Jesus aimed at the same goal for which Emma Goldman struggled, suffered, and died, as did Jesus, namely, what he called "the Kingdom of God," defining it as the rule of God within all life, which creates each form of life and each individual of that form, and most of the time and in most ways controls each individual as an individual in spite of the controls which family, public opinion, and the state, whether as democracies or dictatorships or something else, seek to enforce.

I rejoice that Dr. Reese was present at the funeral and spoke up manfully for the right as he saw the right and for the right as Emma Goldman saw it.

Chicago, Illinois. (REV.) NORMAN B. BARR.

UNITY Policy Commended

Editor of UNITY:

The correspondence department of your brave publication always interests me greatly, as well as the editorials and the special articles. One thing I have learned in fifty years of public life is that the majority of good people do not possess what might be called a "judicial mind or temperament." I have engaged in public debates at times, and also acted as one of the board of judges appointed to decide upon the merits of arguments on part of disputants.

Sometimes, when I have been appointed to take part in a debate, certain people have expressed their amazement when in private I admitted that my side either did not present the better argument, or that the other side possessed, in my judgment, the better merits of the case. One of these good people, a school teacher, remarked to me, "I can never see any side of the question but my own."

So here we are! A subscriber cancels his subscription. He does not "like" an editorial. He may have misconstrued the editorial, or may have construed it correctly. In either case, he discontinues his subscription.

One of the funniest things is that of one reader writing to the paper concerning why he disagrees with some statement of a contributor, or of an editorial, as the case may be, and some other irate reader expressing his disapproval, each reading into the editorial his own reaction—exactly opposite to the other. Any clergyman of experience knows how different members of his congregation may interpret some statement of his—no matter how carefully expressed, even in writing—exactly opposite to one another.

Then there are good people who do not seem to understand the difference between an editorial as such, and a contributed article; that is, they blame the editor if he accepts a contributed article not in line with the editorial views of the publication.

Even in our Supreme Court one can tell pretty well in advance what some particular member of the august body will do over against what some other colleague will do after the presentation of a case brought before the body. One member may be "a strict constructionist" of the Constitution, another a "loose constructionist." Still another member may follow a sort of middle course.

Well, this subscriber hopes that UNITY will keep on sawing wood. He does not worry if the editor and managing editor do not quite "agree" with each other on the war in Europe. He knows that both hate war—as this reader does—but he knows that each editor is a brave and true soul, and that is enough!

GEORGE L. MASON.

Orange, Massachusetts.

Warm Approval

Editor of UNITY:

Mrs. White and I wish you to be sure of our warm and admiring approval of, and thanks for, your unwavering witness for peace and love against all the present mania for warlike preparations.

Your recent editorials in UNITY are an unanswerable challenge to all the so-called leaders and pinchbeck statesmen who hunt today so futilely and fatally after the "dogs of war."

ELIOT WHITE.

Roselle, New Jersey.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 2)

There is a need for training, but not in the lessons that can be learned on the parade ground. We lack men with the skill that is required to take apart an airplane motor and put it together again, to assemble the intricate mechanism of a high-speed tank. We need trained industrial workers, engineers, chemists, machinists to produce the machinery of modern warfare at a greatly increased rate.

Whatever manpower we might waste on training a vast infantry in the immediate future would have to be subtracted from the most important defensive effort we can now make: supplying the Allies with all the materiel of warfare we are able to produce. Whatever equipment we might allocate to an increased United States army in training would have to be diverted from more effective use abroad.

It is obvious that the best use we can make of our resources is to concentrate every effort on building war machines. That is the crying need of the moment; it should not be neglected for the sake of the notion (which had validity at the time of the Civil War) that every man should be handy with a rifle. Modern wars are won with a great many men producing and servicing the flame-throwing tanks and dive-bombers that a few men operate. We must not delay the preparation of effective war machinery in order to raise a helpless, though enormous, force of riflemen.—The New York *Post,* staunch New Deal and Administration organ.